UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/317,434	05/24/99	KOBAYASHI	S 500.37238X00

EXAMINER	
I.E.D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/01

020457
TM02/0913
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON VA 22209

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

1- File Copy

PTO-90C (Rev.11/00)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/317,434	Applicant(s) KOBAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Debbie M Le	Art Unit 2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 May 1999* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al (US Patent 5,983,213).

As per claim 6, Nakano teaches:

first means for enabling a database server operating in a server to output to a file said massive amount of data stored in a database requested by a program operating in a client, and to respond to said request by transmitting said file to said program; and second means for enabling said program to refer to said file where said massive amount of data is outputted by said first means, to obtain said massive amount of data (col. 14-15, lines 63-41).

As per claim 7, Nakano teaches:

means of enabling said database server to create a file identifying information for identifying said file where said massive amount of data is outputted, means of notifying said program of said file identifying information from said database server, and means of enabling said program to refer to said file by using said file identifying information obtained by said notification, to obtain said massive amount of data (fig. 4, col. 9, lines 65-67, col. 10, lines 1-30).

Claim 8 is rejected by the same rationale as stated in independent claim 6 argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al (US Patent 5,983,213).

As per claim 1, Nakano discloses a database processing system comprising:

a first process of enabling a database server operating at a server to store data, which is stored in a database requested by a program operating at a client, and to

respond to said request by transmitting an identifying information of said stored data to said program (abstract, fig. 3b, fig. 4, col. 4-5, lines 38-33, col. 9, lines 27-67, col. 10, lines 1-17); and a second process of enabling said program to refer to said common storage area based on said identifying information of said stored data, to obtain said stored data (fig. 9b, fig. 10, col. 12-13, lines 14-45).

Nakano teaches the data is shared among the servers in the network of plurality of storage devices (col. 10, lines 27-29). Nakano does not explicitly teach a common storage area. "Official Notice" is taken that the use of common storage area in a database processing system disclosed by Nakano is well known and expected in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a common storage area disclosed by Nakano, because the use of common storage area is known in the art to enable the users of different hosts to access to the same data and/or the use of common storage area is a choice of implementation to one of ordinary skilled in the art whether he wants to store data in a plurality of storage areas as disclosed by Nakano or just wants to store data in a only one place "a common storage".

As per claim 2, Nakano teaches:

a third process of enabling said database server to create a storage area identifying information for identifying the area on said storage device to which said data is outputted (fig. 4, col. 9, lines 65-67, col. 10, lines 1-30);

a fourth process of notifying said program of said storage area identifying information from said database server, and a fifth process of enabling said program to

refer to the area on said storage device using said storage identifying information obtained by said notification to obtain said data (fig. 7, 9a-9b, 10, col. 11-12, lines 5-62).

As per claim 3, Nakano teaches:

a sixth process of enabling said program to request an execution of a function defined in said database, a seventh process of enabling said database server to execute said function according to a request from said program, an eighth process of enabling said function to create a storage area identifying information of said storage device to which said data is outputted, a ninth process of enabling said function to output said data to said storage area; and a tenth process of enabling said function to notify said database server of said storage area identifying information (fig. 2, 3b, col. 8-9, lines 2-46).

As per claim 4, Nakano teaches:

A process of enabling plural processes, which has a parallel database arrangement and executes a database process in parallel, to output said data to said storage device in parallel (fig. 1-2, col. 5, lines 10-34).

As per claim 5, Nakano teaches:

a process of enabling said program to refer to said storage device to which said data is outputted by said database server, at the same node as a node where said database server is in operation to obtain said data (fig. 1-2, col. 4, lines 16-21, col. 7-8, lines 61-29).

Conclusion

6. Claims 1-8 are rejected.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose phone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debbie M Le whose telephone number is (703) 308-6409. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-9051 for regular communications and (703) 308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Debbie Le
September 7, 2001

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100